

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 5-9, 11-12, 14-18, 21, 24-29 and 31-42 are pending. By this Amendment, Claim 28 is amended and new Claims 37-42 are added.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-2, 5-7, 14-16, 25-29, 32-33 and 35-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,792,148 to Wergeland, *et al.* (Wergeland). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Wergeland's captured, *uncompressed* image frames correspond to the first data format recited in independent Claims 1, 28 and 35. As shown in Figure 1 of Wergeland, these captured, uncompressed image frames are conveyed from the processor 110 of the camera accessory 100 via a *direct feed 115* and an interface 150 to a mobile terminal, see also Wergeland at column 5, lines 9-16 (C5/L9-16).

However, U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/159,644 to which Wergeland claims priority, does not disclose or suggest conveying captured, uncompressed image frames from the camera accessory, and fails to disclose the direct feed 115 shown in Figure 1 of Wergeland. Accordingly, the feature of Wergeland that the Examiner asserts corresponds to data in the first format is entitled only to Wergeland's filing date of 06 October 2000 and is therefore not prior art to the present application, which was filed earlier on 15 August 2000. For at least this reason, Wergeland fails to anticipate independent Claims 1, 28 and 35 and the claims depending from them.

Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-2, 5-7, 14-16, 25-29, 32-33 and 35-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Wergeland is respectfully requested.

With respect to new Claims 41-42, Applicant respectfully submits that the Wergeland Provisional Application suggests that two *alternative* data formats may be used, e.g. JPEG compression or MPEG-4 compression as shown in the figure on page 4 of the Wergeland Provisional Application. As is well known in the art, JPEG format is appropriate for still shots (e.g. single photographs) while MPEG is appropriate for movies, e.g. moving or continuous image

capture. These two different formats are typically *not* captured or calculated simultaneously, because each is appropriate for a different situation. Accordingly, the Wergeland Provisional Application appears to teach away from a processor splitting a data packet comprising image data into a mobile terminal part and an external display device part, and similar features recited in Claim 41. Applicant further notes that the Wergeland Provisional does not disclose or suggest either combining image data from two different formats into a single packet, or splitting a data packet comprising image data into a mobile terminal part and an external display device part. In addition, the Wergeland Provisional fails to disclose or suggest a processor determining a location of the external display device part within a data frame structure of the data packet based on a length of the mobile terminal part, and similar features recited in Claim 42. For at least these reasons, the Wergeland Provisional Application fails to disclose or suggest Claims 41-42.

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration on the merits and prompt allowance are respectfully requested. In the event any questions arise regarding this communication or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: 17 May 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael J. Hean

M. David Ream

Registration No.: 35,333

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant